

### **REMARKS**

Claims 13, 15-19, 25-45 and 47 are pending in the present application. Claims 25-31 have been canceled herein without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter contained therein. Claims 13, 38, 32, and 44 are independent and have been amended to include features of claim 16, which the Examiner indicated as being allowable. Claim 16 has been amended to remove features that were moved to the independent claims.

Reconsideration and allowance of the subject application are respectfully requested.

#### **Allowable Subject Matter**

Applicant thanks the Examiner for recognizing the allowability of claims 16-18 and 41. Features of claim 16 have been incorporated into independent claims 13, 32, 38, and 44. Claims 17, 18, and 41 have not been amended to independent form because Applicant asserts that claims 17, 18, and 41 are allowable at least because claims 17, 18, and 41 each depend from at least one of independent claims 13 and 38 amended to include allowable subject matter.

#### **Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)**

Claims 32 and 34-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ho et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,553,227). Applicant respectfully traverses.

With regard to independent claim 32, Applicant asserts that Ho et al. fail to disclose, teach, or suggest a method of managing data messages, comprising, at least: sending deregistration data including at least one of a mobile switching center identifier and a cell identifier from a first wireless system to a central database, as recited in claim 32. Instead, Ho et al. disclose sending a CANCEL\_LOCATION\_ACK message. Applicant asserts that the ACK message is not the same as a mobile switching center identifier or cell identifier. Therefore, Ho et al. cannot disclose or suggest sending deregistration data including at least one of a mobile

switching center identifier and a cell identifier from a first wireless system to a central database as recited in claim 32.

With regard to dependent claims 33-37 Applicant asserts that claims 33-37 are allowable at least because they depend from claim 32 which is allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that the art grounds of rejection be withdrawn.

**Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 13, 19, 38-40, 44, 45, and 47 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills (U.S. Patent No. 5,890,063) in view of Alperovich et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,101,393). Applicant respectfully traverses.

With regard to claim 13, Applicant asserts that claim 13 is allowable at least because it includes the features of independent claim 16, which the Examiner has indicated as being allowable.

With regard to claim 19, Applicant asserts that claim 19 is allowable at least because it depends from amended independent claim 13.

With regard to independent claim 38, Applicant asserts that claim 38 is allowable at least because it includes the features of independent claim 16, which the Examiner has indicated as being allowable.

With regard to dependent claims 39 and 40, Applicant asserts that claims 39 and 40 are allowable at least because they each depend from amended independent claim 38.

With regard to dependent claim 44, Applicant asserts that Mills and Alperovich et al., singly or in combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest a method of managing data messages, comprising, at least: received information including the deregistration data, the deregistration data including at least one of a mobile switching center identifier and a cell identifier, from the

first wireless system and registration data from the second wireless system, as recited in claim 44. Instead, Mills discloses sending update information to update a user profile in a first wireless system in response to service for a mobile station being transferred from the first wireless system to the second wireless system. However, Mills fails to disclose deregistration data including at least one of a mobile switching center identifier and a cell identifier.

Alperovich et al. is directed to selective acceptance of short message service (SMS) messages in a cellular telephone network. Alperovich et al. discloses selective acceptance of short messages that enables a cellular subscriber to predetermine which short message will actually be delivered to the subscriber's mobile station. Using an Unstructured Supplementary Service Data (USSD) transmission, the subscriber determines which selection criteria will be used and then builds in a network Home Location Register (HLR) a list of originating entities from which short messages will either be accepted or rejected. A screening application resident on the HLR then determines the identity of the entity associated with any request for short message routing information and causes the short message to be delivered or deleted according to the input provided by the subscriber. A confirmation message is returned to the originating entity indicating delivery or the reason for failure. However, Alperovich fails to disclose deregistration data including at least one of a mobile switching center identifier and a cell identifier.

Therefore, Mills and Alperovich et al., separately or combined in any proper combination, fail to disclose, teach, or suggest received information including at least one of deregistration data including at least one of a mobile switching center identifier and a cell identifier, from the first wireless system and registration data from the second wireless system, as recited in claim 44.

With regard to dependent claims 45 and 47, Applicant asserts that claims 45 and 47 are allowable at least because they each depend from claim 44 which is allowable.

Applicant respectfully requests that the art grounds of rejection be withdrawn.

Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Alperovich et al. and in further view of allegedly well known prior art. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant asserts that claim 15 is allowable at least because claim 15 depends from amended claim 13. Applicant respectfully requests that the art grounds of rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 42 and 43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Mills in view of Alperovich et al. and in further view of Bremer. Applicant respectfully traverses.

Applicant asserts that claims 42 and 43 are allowable at least because claims 42 and 43 depend from amended independent claim 38. Applicant respectfully requests that the art grounds of rejection be withdrawn.

### **CONCLUSION**

In view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration and withdrawal of all presently outstanding rejections is respectfully requested. In the event that there are any outstanding matters remaining in the present application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (703) 668-8000 in the Washington, D.C. area, to discuss this application.


Appl. No. 09/393,300

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By:

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to be "Gary D. Yacura", is written over a horizontal line. To the right of the signature, the number "45,274" is handwritten.

Gary D. Yacura  
Registration No. 35,416  
P.O. Box 8910  
Reston, Virginia 20195

GDY/MJL/RFS